

CIA 5-03.2

Letters to the editor

Dr. Kissinger at Georgetown

Mary McGrory contrasted the slow-to-react, socially and politically satiated Georgetown students with Columbia University's students who have historically used the forces of turmoil to keep the administration's nose clean. (I assume she is referring to Columbia's student protests in April, 1968, over the building of a swimming pool, a dispute which mushroomed into some deep social conflict). She quoted a Georgetown student as saying that because of the socialization of the Catholic mind, the students at Georgetown are passive toward figures of authority, and therefore would permit Kissinger to teach.

Maybe this student is right. Perhaps the Catholic mind is not suited to social protest, but tell that to the organizers of the *Georgetown Voice* (a campus weekly which was created by the students during the 60s) or those voicing their opinion over WGTB-FM.

However, maybe "early religious training" has nothing to do with the view of the "silent majority." I think a more logical analysis of the ennui on Georgetown's campus is a realization that if an objective moral standard for professorships or administrative positions were implemented, it would be necessary to purge half of the faculty. The Georgetown student is battered with evidence, true or untrue, of unethical conduct on the part of many prestigious people in the university community. For instance, last spring, a local organization protested that five or six professors were serving on Pentagon committees whose job it is to plan various varieties of genocide.

Earlier this year, in a campus publication, an assistant dean was accused of participating in covert activities while working for the CIA. Some professors have allegedly been associated during the Vietnam era with organizations which engaged in acts of anti-war violence which in the mind of any conscientious objector would be equally as immoral as Kissinger's domestic wiretaps.

Not to mention evidence of a CIA contribution of over \$300,000 to the medical school for the purpose of conducting drug experiments on human subjects.

So, from the standpoint of a student at Georgetown, you can see that the Kissinger appointment is just another in a series of moral transgressions which serve to make even the most activist student docile. Attributing this attitude to religion and socialization is just stupid, and should have been omitted from your condemnation of Georgetown students.

Maybe we are wrong for letting Kissinger teach. But it isn't the only morally compromising event occurring at Georgetown. You may say that one must draw a line. OK, we have two choices: one, conduct a McCarthyite purging of every professor ever connected with any organization of questionable moral repute (the CIA, the SDS, etc.); or, draw a line at Kissinger and condone past actions of tenured professors; or have a quota of immorality.

In other words, the question of Kissinger's professorship is not a black-and-white issue of academic freedom at Georgetown. Its roots go deeper. I feel your investigation should have gone deeper, too. Visit us and ask us before you condemn our inactivity.

Jeremiah J. Lucey,
Class of 1980
College of Arts and Sciences
Georgetown University

Washington, D.C.